

CASE NO.: ARC9-2001-0079US1

Serial No.: 09/933,494

June 29, 2006

Page 3

PATENT

Filed: August 20, 2001

The references in the preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein. Claim 19 sets forth a diskless computer (14, above) that has a CPU (16, above) running an operating system which is not modified to not issue local disk I/O requests (page 3, lines 15 and 16) and a disk-free adapter (26, above) communicating with the operating system and receiving disk I/O requests therefrom, with the adapter translating the disk I/O requests to network requests. A network connection (page 6, line 2, figures 1 and 2) is provided through which the disk I/O requests can be satisfied despite the lack of a local hard disk drive in the computer.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed**

(a) Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Kedem et al.

(b) Claims 9, 18, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Kedem et al.

(c) Claims 7, 16, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Kedem et al. in view of Kathail et al.

**(7a) Argument**

The error in the rejections is manifest and will be succinctly dealt with. It is alleged that while Kedem et al. fails to explicitly teach that its LDIM, used as the claimed adaptor, translates disk I/O requests to network requests, such is "inherent" in order "to handle requests from a CPU and to communicate to a remote server through a network".

This is a false reading of Kedem et al. In fact, Kedem et al teaches precisely the opposite of what the examiner alleges is inherent.

**APPENDIX B - EVIDENCE**

None (this sheet made necessary by 69 Fed. Reg. 155 (August 2004), page 49978.)

**APPENDIX C - RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

None (this sheet made necessary by 69 Fed. Reg. 155 (August 2004), page 49978.)